



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/483,069	01/14/2000	Frederick Lo	CA990010	7857
25259	7590	03/26/2004	EXAMINER	
IBM CORPORATION			ROSS, EDWARD J	
3039 COWNALLIS RD.				
DEPT. T81 / B503, PO BOX 12195				
REASEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2126	
DATE MAILED: 03/26/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/483,069	LO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Edward Bross	2126	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 February 2004.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-4 and 7-13 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-4 and 7-13 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-4, and 7-13 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-4, and 7-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims language is not clear for the following reasons:
 - a. Claims 1, 2, 7 and 8 – It is unclear what is meant by “strongly typed”.
 - b. Claims 1 and 8 refer to an “ERP application” without defining the term “ERP”.
 - c. Claim 9 claims an article of manufacture; however, it is dependent on claims 1-3 which all claim a method.
 - d. Claim 10 claims an article of manufacture; however, it is dependent on claims 4 which claims a method.
 - e. Claim 11 claims an article of manufacture; however it is dependent on claim 1 which claims a method, and on claim 8, which claims a system.
 - f. Claim 13 claims a method; however it is dependent on claim 8 which claims a system.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

5. Claims 8 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Beauchamp (6,621,505).

6. As to claim 8, Beauchamp teaches the invention as claimed including a client server ERP information handling system comprising a web browser on a client computer adapted to send requests to an ERP database and receive information from an ERP database, a web server for sending panels to and receiving requests from said browser, and a gateway object for translating between the web server and the ERP database (e.g. fig. 7).

7. As to claim 13, Beauchamp also discloses that the strongly typed object form is a Java object (col. 21, line 59).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. Claims 1-4, and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the J2EE specification in view of Beauchamp (6,621,505).

Art Unit: 2126

9. As to claim 1, the J2EE specification teaches

- (a) transmitting a HyperText Markup Language (HTML) input form to a browser executed by a client computer in said network for display on a monitor attached thereto; (e.g. "JSP page is returned" 3-4),
- (b) receiving a HyperText Transfer Protocol (HTTP) request from said browser to access said system, wherein a request to the server optionally includes data entered by said user into an HTML form; ("Next, the user performs some action (perhaps posting form data)" 3-4),
- (c) transferring any data entered by said user into an HTML input form and any data stored in said requested HTML page (3-3 and 3-4)
- (h) transmitting said HTML or XML object to said browser for display on said monitor attached to said client computer (3-4).

10. The J2EE specification does not teach:

- executing ERP application requests via a network,
- (c) transferring any data entered by said user into an input form and any data stored in said requested page into said ERP application API,
- (d) transferring control to said ERP application for execution,
- (e) receiving output data from said ERP application in response to said transmitted data and request.
- (f) merging said output data from said ERP application into a strongly typed Java object,
- (g) transforming said strongly typed Java objects into a transmittable format, such as XML or HTML;

11. Beauchamp et al. teaches

executing ERP application requests via a network (fig. 7).

(c) transferring any data entered by said user into an input form and any data stored in said requested page into said ERP application API (col. 21, lines 27-38 and 47).

(d) transferring control to said ERP application for execution (fig. 7).

(e) receiving output data from said ERP application in response to said transmitted data and request (fig. 7),

(f) merging said output data from said ERP application into a strongly typed Java object (col. 21, lines 59-60 and col. 22, lines 5-10)

(g) transforming said strongly typed Java objects into a transmittable format, such as XML or HTML; (col. 24, lines 23-28)

12. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Beauchamp and the J2EE specification because this would allow the access to legacy ERP applications as taught by Beauchamp to be added to the data sources already supported by the J2EE specification.

13. As to claim 2, Beauchamp teaches merging the data from the ERP application into a strongly typed Java object (col. 21, lines 59-60 and col. 22, lines 5-10), wherein the business objects (BO) (216, Fig. 7) and the BO Gateway (218, Fig. 7) both provides a communications path to the ERP system and, as shown above, merges the data into a strongly typed object, they serve the same functional purpose as the ERP Web Gateway in the applicant's claim.

14. As to claim 3, Beauchamp teaches that the input form, dynamic ERP Application data access, Java object definitions and report form are stored in form of XML files (col. 6 lines 60-62, col. 21 lines 59-60, col. 22 lines 5-10, and col. 24 lines 25-36). Beauchamp does not explicitly teach that the input and report forms are HTML, however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use HTML instead of XML as this would allow presentation of the objects in a standard web browser without the need for a specialized client.

15. As to claim 4, Beauchamp teaches said XML file strongly couples said data in said ERP Application to said Java objects and said XML file which specifies the presentation of the ERP Application data (col. 22, lines 5-10. and col. 21 lines 17-19).

16. As to claim 9, it is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1, 2, and 3.

17. As to claim 10, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 4.

18. Claims 7 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over XMLC Tutorial.

19. As to claims 7 and 11 XMLC tutorial teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a method of presenting Java objects using HTML by merging Java objects with XML template files (p. 3, lines 6-9). XMLC Tutorial does not explicitly disclose that the Java objects are

Art Unit: 2126

strongly typed. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use strongly typed Java objects as objects in Java are strongly typed by default and to use weakly typed objects would have involved more time and effort to develop with no clear advantages to be gained.

20. Claim 12 is rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over XMLC Tutorial in view of Beauchamp (6,621,505).

21. As to claim 12, XMLC Tutorial does not teach the step of merging output data from an ERP application into at least one of the Java objects. Beauchamp teaches the step of merging output data from an ERP application into at least one of the Java objects (col. 21, lines 59-60 and col. 22, lines 5-10).

22. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the XMLC Tutorial and Beauchamp to allow the architecture of the XMLC Tutorial to be used to access ERP data sources.

23. Applicant arguments for claims 1-4, 7-13, filed on 2/5/04 have been considered but they are not persuasive in view of the new grounds of rejection.

24. In the remarks, Applicant argued in substance that (1) there is no teaching of any type data conversion by a gateway, (2) there is no teaching of a merging operation, (3) the cited references

Art Unit: 2126

have been improperly combined, (4) no teaching of “transferring data entered... into said ERP application API”, (5) no teaching of “said HTML input form... stored on form of XML files” and (6) no teaching of “said XML file strongly couples said data”

A. As to point (1), the combination of Beauchamp and J2EE specification meets the respective recited limitations as shown through the mappings provided in the claim rejections above. In addition, as to claim 8, the applicant claims that Beauchamp does not teach any type data conversion by a gateway. However, this conversion is a necessary and implicit part of the “bridge native interface” function as taught by Beauchamp (col. 20, line 6). Therefore the rejection is maintained.

B. As to points (2)-(6), see the paragraphs 8-12 above.

25. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward Bross whose telephone number is 305-8754. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on 305-9678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.



MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Art Unit: 2126

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

EB


MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100